

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## NOTES OF CASES.

ROLLING STOCK OF FOREIGN RAILEOAD NOT SUBJECT TO ATTACHMENT.—The Circuit Court of the city of Richmond (Judge Scott presiding) recently decided in Chalkley v. R., F. & P. R. R. that the rolling stock of a foreign railroad was not subject to attachment in this State. Counsel for the railroad contended that the attachment should be dismissed, because to allow attachment of rolling stock (1) would interfere with the performance of the contract for the use of the rolling stock between the owners of the same and the resident company, on whose tracks it was attached; (2) it is in violation of public policy; (3) and an interference with interstate commerce. Among the cases relied on were Wall v. N. & W. R. R. Company, 44 S. E. 294; Conway v. Q. O. & R. C. R. Company, 99 N. W. 365.

Taxes—State Taxation of Property in the Hands of Trustee in Bankruptcy.—Property in the hands of a trustee in bankruptcy is not exempted from liability to State taxation by the bankruptcy act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. at L. 548, chap. 541, U. S. Comp. Stat. 1901, p. 3418). Swarts, Trustee, v. Hammer, 24 Sup. Ct. 695.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—VALIDITY OF STATE LOCAL OPTION LAW—EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS.—A State local option law does not deny a retail liquor dealer the equal protection of the laws because it excepts from its operation druggists, manufacturers, persons who give away liquors in their private dwellings, and railway corporations dispensing liquors in dining and buffet cars under State license.

State of Ohio v. Dollison, 24 Sup. Ct. 703. See Savages' Case, 84 Va. 619, 5 S. E. 565, as to constitutionality of local option laws.

CONTRACTS—IMPAIRMENT OF OBLIGATION—CHANGE OF LAW RESPECTING REDEMPTION FROM FORECLOSURE SALE.—No contract right of an independent purchaser at a foreclosure sale, who has no other connection with the mortgage contract than that arising from his purchase for a sum sufficient to pay the mortgage debt, is impaired by changes in the law subsequent to the execution of the mortgage, but prior to the sale, with reference to the time of redemption and the rate of interest payable in order to redeem.

Hooker v. Burr et als., 24 Sup. Ct. 706.

MERCHANDISE—SALE OF STOCK IN BULK.—A law of Utah passed in 1901 (substantially the same as our Act—Acts 1902-'3-'4, p. 884), provided that a sale of any portion of a stock of merchandise out of the ordinary course of trade, or a sale of an entire stock in bulk, is fraudulent and void